



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,487	11/13/2000	Rudy G Bonefas	003636.0098	4562

7590

09/19/2005

ATTEN: WILLIAM H. BOLLMAN
MANELLI DEMIDON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M STREET, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20016

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/709,487

Applicant(s)

BONEFAS ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R. Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 56-66 and 86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 56-66 and 86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

CT

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-86 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 1-30, 56-65, 86 are presented for examination.

Claims 31-55, 67-85 are withdrawn.

No claims are canceled.

Claims 1, 9, 56, 57, and 86 are amended.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/3/05 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claims 1-6, 8-17, 23-27, 30, 56-66, 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen.

Regarding claim 1,

Jamtgaard teaches a system for deploying content to devices (Jamtgaard: col. 2, line 40; col. 4, lines 34-39), comprising:

a translator operative to receive data sent from devices and to translate said data into a standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);

a content provider interface operative to receive said data in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 32-37; content connection handler and appliance connection handler; Fig 4, tags 40 and 44) and to provide content data in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-58, lines 12-26, 31-47 xml engine);

a transformer operative to receive said content data and to transform said content data into a format for a particular device (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 4-7; layout engine); and

The Jamtgaard reference does not explicitly state a session manager that examines content to identify and return state-based information.

The Allen reference teaches

session managing to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; check

Art Unit: 2155

token) and to identify and return state-based information comprising at least one of a hypertext history and a session token based on interactions (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; checks and returns tokens) between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 7, lines 12-20; Figure 2).

The Allen reference further teaches the invention employs tokens to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard while employing a session manager as taught by Allen in order to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Claims 2-6, 8 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Allen and Jamtgaard.

Regarding claim 2, the system according to claim 1, wherein:

said standardized format is an XML message (Jamtgaard: col. 2, line 53).

Regarding claim 3, the system according to claim 1, wherein:

said transformer is operative to select a transformation based on a pre-selected format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-63; rml) and to transform said content data using said selected transformation (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-63).

Regarding claim 4, the system according to claim 3, wherein:

said transformation is selected from a group of XSL style sheets (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 60- col. 11, line 9).

Regarding claim 5, the system according to claim 3, wherein:

said transformer is operative to select a plurality of transforms (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 60- col. 11, line 9) and to apply said plurality of transforms in at least one of: sequentially and independently, to transform said content data (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 65- col. 12, line 65; example of html to rml page).

Regarding claim 6, the system according to claim 1, further comprising:

an extractor operative to access session information about a browser of said particular device (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 1-6; col. 7, lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 8, the system according to claim 1, wherein:

said devices are wireless devices (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 7-25).

Regarding claim 9, a method of communicating with devices that use different communication schemes (Jamtgaard: col. 4, lines 66- col. 5, line 6), comprising:

receiving first data from one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67);

translating said first data into a standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);
providing said translated data to a content provider interface (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 32-37; content connection handler and appliance connection handler; Fig 4, tags 40 and 44);
receiving second data response from said content provider interface in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-58, lines 12-26, 31-47 xml);
transforming said second data into content type specific forms for the one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 4-7; layout engine); and
forwarding said transformed second data to said one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 20, lines 63-65); and

The Jamtgaard reference does not explicitly state a session manager that examines content to identify and return state-based information.

The Allen reference teaches

session managing to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; check token) and to identify and return state-based information comprising at least one of a hypertext history and a session token based on interactions (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; checks and returns tokens) between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 7, lines 12-20; Figure 2).

The Allen reference further teaches the invention employs tokens to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard while employing a session manager as taught by Allen in order to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Claims 10-17, 23-27, 30 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Allen and Jamtgaard.

Regarding claim 10, the method according to claim 9, further comprising:

extracting information about said device from said first data (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 1-6; col. 7, lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 11, the method according to claim 10, wherein:

said extracted information includes device specific features (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 1-6; type of device).

Regarding claim 12, the method according to claim 10, wherein the transforming step comprises:

selecting an XSL style sheet based on said extracted information (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-63;); and

using said selected XSL style sheet to transform said second data (Jamtgaard: col.s 11 and 12, the XSL stylesheet transformation).

Regarding claim 13, the method according to claim 10, wherein:

Art Unit: 2155

said extracted information includes information about a browser (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 46-47).

Regarding claim 14, the method according to claim 10, wherein:

said extracted information includes a message key (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 25-46).

Regarding claim 15, the method according to claim 14, further comprising:

selecting said content provider interface based on said message key (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 40, 41; URL address).

Regarding claim 16, the method according to claim 14, wherein:

said message key includes at least one of a vertical market; an action; an action type; and a content provider identifier (ID) (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 40, 41; URL address).

Regarding claim 17, the method according to claim 16, wherein:

said vertical market is a brokerage market, said action is a quote, said action type is at least one of a request and a response, and said content provider ID corresponds to a particular brokerage (Jamtgaard: col. 13, lines 51-53).

Regarding claim 23, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said first data is a request (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 53-66).

Regarding claim 24, the method according to claim 23, wherein:

said request is a hyper-text transfer protocol (HTTP) request (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 25, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said second data is a response (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 31-47; transmit to the requesting information device).

Regarding claim 26, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said standardized format of said second data is an XML message format (Jamtgaard: col. 2, line 53).

Regarding claim 27, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said content provider is a third party (Jamtgaard: Figure 4, tag 13).

Regarding claim 30, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said device is a wireless device (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 7-25).

Regarding claim 56, a method of communicating from a device to a controller using different communication schemes (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 5, lines 7-25), comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

sending first data from one or more devices using one or more transmission formats to a controller (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67); and

receiving from said controller second data using content specific forms for said one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 64-67), wherein said first data is translated by said controller into a standardized format and conveyed to a content provider (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 59-64; col. 4, lines 61-66);

receiving said second data by said controller from said content provider in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-58, lines 12-26, 31-47); and

transforming by said controller said second data into said content specific forms (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 4-7; layout engine); and

The Jamtgaard reference does not explicitly state a session manager that examines content to identify and return state-based information.

The Allen reference teaches

session managing to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; check token) and to identify and return state-based information comprising at least one of a hypertext history and a session token based on interactions (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; checks and returns tokens) between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 7, lines 12-20; Figure 2).

The Allen reference further teaches the invention employs tokens to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard while employing a session manager as taught by Allen in order to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Regarding claim 57, a method of transforming data (Jamtgaard: col. 4, lines 58-66), comprising: receiving a message (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20); extracting information from said message (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 1-6; col. 7, lines 44-47);

selecting transformation specifications based on said extracted information (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 31-34, lines 46-61);

session managing to examine data content within said message and to identify and return state-based information comprising at least one of a hypertext history and a session token based on interactions between one or more devices and a content provider (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 25-46); and

applying said selected transformation specifications and said state based information to said data (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 55-61).

The Jamtgaard reference does not explicitly state a session manager that examines content to identify and return state-based information.

The Allen reference teaches

session managing to examine data content within a message (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; check token) to identify and return state-based information comprising at least one of

Art Unit: 2155

a hypertext history and a session token based on interactions (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; checks and returns tokens) between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 7, lines 12-20; Figure 2).

The Allen reference further teaches the invention employs tokens to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard while employing a session manager as taught by Allen in order to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Claims 58-66 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Allen and Jamtgaard.

Regarding claim 58, the method of claim 57, further comprising:

retrieving said transformation specifications from a database (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 37-40).

Regarding claim 59, the method of claim 57, further comprising cross-referencing said transformation specifications in said database to said extracted information (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 37-48).

Regarding claim 60, the method of claim 57, wherein:

said message includes a message key (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 25-46).

Regarding claim 61, the method according to claim 60 wherein:

said message key includes at least one of a vertical market; an action; an action type; and a content provider identifier (ID) (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 40, 41; URL address).

Regarding claim 62, the method of claim 57, wherein said message comprises:

session information including at least one of a user agent and a device type (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 34-41).

Regarding claim 63, the method of claim 57, wherein:

said transformation specifications are specified as XSL style sheets (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-63).

Regarding claim 64, the method of claim 63, wherein:

a single XSL style sheet is selected (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 65- col. 12, line 65; example of html to rml page).

Regarding claim 65, the method of claim 63, wherein:

multiple XSL style sheets are selected (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 65- col. 11, line 9).

Regarding claim 66, the method of claim 57, wherein:

said message is an XML message (Jamtgaard: col. 2, line 53).

Regarding claim 86, a system for communicating from a device to a controller using different communication schemes (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 5, lines 7-25), comprising:

means for sending first data from one or more device using one or more transmission formats to a controller (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);

means for receiving from said controller second data using content specific forms for said one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);

means for translating said first data by said controller into a standardized format conveyed to a content provider (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 59-64; col. 4, lines 61-66);

means for receiving said second data by said controller from said content provider in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-58, lines 12-26, 31-47); and

transforming by said controller said second data into said content specific forms (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 4-7; layout engine); and

The Jamtgaard reference does not explicitly state a session manager that examines content to identify and return state-based information.

The Allen reference teaches

means for session managing to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; check token) and to identify and return state-based information comprising at least one of a hypertext history and a session token based on interactions (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; checks and returns tokens) between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 7, lines 12-20; Figure 2).

The Allen reference further teaches the invention employs tokens to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard while employing a session manager as taught by Allen in order to improve scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, and security (Allen: col. 4, lines 49-57).

Claims 7 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,116 by Namma et al.

Regarding claim 7,

The Jamtgaard and Allen references teach the system according to claim 1, receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider.

The Jamtgaard and Allen references do not explicitly disclose sending the data to more than one content provider.

The Namma reference teaches a composer operative to generate a combined response to a particular device (Namma: col. 4, lines 2-10) from a plurality of responses received to a plurality of requests provided to a plurality of content providers (Namma: col. 3, lines 45- col. 4, line 18).

Art Unit: 2155

The Namma reference further teaches the invention allows concurrent display of many requests and to reduces load on the browser (Namma: col. 30, lines 38-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider as taught by Jamtgaard and Allen while employing a combined response as taught by Namma in order to concurrently display of many requests at once and to reduces load on the browser (Namma: col. 30, lines 38-56)

Regarding claim 29,

The Jamtgaard and Allen references teach the method according to claim 9, wherein method of communicating with devices that use different communication schemes (Jamtgaard: col. 4, lines 66- col. 5, line 6), comprising: receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider.

The Jamtgaard and Allen references do not explicitly disclose sending the data to more than one content provider.

The Namma reference teaches a composer operative to generate a combined response to a particular device (Namma: col. 4, lines 2-10) from a plurality of responses received to a plurality of requests provided to a plurality of content providers (Namma: col. 3, lines 45- col. 4, line 18).

The Namma reference further teaches the invention allows concurrent display of many requests and to reduces load on the browser (Namma: col. 30, lines 38-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider as taught by Jamtgaard and Allen while employing a combined response as taught by Namma in order to concurrently display of many requests at once and to reduces load on the browser (Namma: col. 30, lines 38-56)

Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,975 by Nielson.

Regarding claim 18,

The Jamtgaard and Allen references teach the method according to claim 9, receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider.

The Jamtgaard and Allen references do not explicitly disclose style sheets applied independently to the second data.

The Nielson reference teaches at least two style sheets are selected and applied independently to the second data (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36).

The Nielson reference further teaches the invention extends the capabilities of style sheets adding additional functionality and a much more pleasing and semantically consistent presentation for the user (Nielson: col. 1, lines 54-57; col. 8, lines 28, 29).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider

Art Unit: 2155

as taught by Jamtgaard and Allen while employing two or more style sheets as taught by Nielson in order to extend the capabilities of style sheets and make a more pleasing presentation to the user (Nielson: col. 1, lines 54-57; col. 8, lines 28, 29).

Claims 19-22 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Jamtgaard, Allen and Nielson.

Regarding claim 19, the method according to claim 12, wherein at least two style sheets are selected and applied to transform the second data (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 20, the method according to claim 19, wherein the style sheets are applied sequentially (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36; applied to a particular document by priority; col. 1, lines 54-57; cascading).

Regarding claim 21, the method according to claim 19, wherein an order of applying the style sheets is pre-selected (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 22, the method according to claim 19, wherein at least three style sheets are applied both independently and sequentially (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36; applied to a particular document by priority; col. 1, lines 54-57; cascading).

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0010716 by McCartney et al.

Regarding claim 28,

The Jamtgaard and Allen references teach the method according to claim 9, receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider.

The Jamtgaard and Allen references do not explicitly state querying a provider's database.

The McCartney et al reference teaches querying a provider database (McCartney: page 2, paragraph 0020); and

receiving a previously registered XSL style sheet associated with said new content provider from the provider database (McCartney: page 2, paragraph 0020).

The McCartney reference further teaches the invention optimizes the web site for clients have different capabilities (page 1, paragraph 0007).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider as taught by Jamtgaard and Allen while querying the provider database to get an XSL as taught by McCartney in order to optimize the web site for clients have different capabilities (page 1, paragraph 0007).

REMARKS

Applicant has amended each of the independent claims to include a limitation specifying a session manager to examine content to identify and return one of a hypertext history and a session token based on interactions.

The Applicant Argues:

With respect some of the dependent claims, that no prima facie evidence that the cited passages in Vange is contained in any provisional applications.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

First point to make is that the applications are still accessible through the public pair system (<http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>) and by request through the office. As 37 C.F.R. 1.14(a)(1) states

(iv) Unpublished abandoned applications (including provisional applications) that are identified or relied upon. The file contents of an unpublished, abandoned application may be made available to the public if the application is identified in a U.S. patent, a statutory invention registration, a U.S. patent application publication, or an international patent application publication of an international application that was published in accordance with PCT Article 21(2). An application is considered to have been identified in a document, such as a patent, when the application number or serial number and filing date, first named inventor, title and filing date or other application specific information are provided in the text of the patent, but not when the same identification is made in a paper in the file contents of the patent and is not included in the printed patent. Also, the file contents may be made available to the public, upon a written request, if benefit of the abandoned application is claimed under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121, or 365 in an application that has issued as a U.S. patent, or has published as a statutory invention registration, a U.S. patent application publication, or an international patent application that was published in accordance with PCT Article 21(2). A copy of the application-as-filed, the file contents of the application, or a specific document in the file of the application may be provided to any person upon written request, and payment of the appropriate fee (§ 1.19(b)).

In response to the argument that there is no prima facie evidence, the examiner has pointed to the relevant portions of the McCartney publication. The examiner will further point to portions of the cited provision.

U.S. Publication No. 2002/0010716 by McCartney et al is continued off provisional application 60/184,812 filed February 24, 2000.

The McCartney et al reference teaches querying a provider database (McCartney: page 2, paragraph 0020); and

receiving a previously registered XSL style sheet associated with said new content provider from the provider database (McCartney: page 2, paragraph 0020).

The McCartney et al provisional reference teaches querying a provider database (McCartney: page 3 bottom of the page to page 4, para 3); and

receiving a previously registered XSL style sheet associated with said new content provider from the provider database (McCartney: page 4, 1st para).

PRIOR ART

U.S. Patent No. 6,871,213 by Graham et al teaches a session manager for storing and sharing session information col. 8, lines 10-40 and col. 9, lines 27-33.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb



SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER